

REMARKS

General:

Claims 1-3 and 5-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3 and 5-14 stand rejected.

35 U.S.C. §112 rejection and objection to the drawings:

Claim 14 stands rejected as not being enabled by the disclosure. The examiner points out that in the embodiment shown in Figs. 2 to 4 is capable of rotation through 360° about the connection between the screw base 26 and the lower leg 24, but only through an angle less than 360° about the hinge 35. It is respectfully pointed out that those are not the only possible rotations. As is disclosed in paragraph [0023], the adapter may be provided with a 360° rotation between the screw base 26 and the lower leg 24, and with a second 360° rotation between the top leg 22 and the outer housing 16 of the socket part. It is respectfully pointed out that the description in paragraph [0023] with reference to Figs. 5 and 6 of the drawings, in combination with the detailed description of two embodiments of 360° rotary connection with reference to Figs. 2 and 4, is sufficient to enable a person skilled in the art to make and use the invention as claimed in claim 14. The description at paragraph [0020], last sentence, specifically points out that the same design of rotary connection may be used between the top leg 22 and the outer housing 16 as between the screw base 26 and the lower leg 24. Thus, Figs. 5 and 6, read together with Fig. 2 and/or Fig. 4 as instructed by the description, do show every element necessary to the invention as claimed in claim 14, and it is respectfully submitted that a further drawing specifically of the embodiment described in paragraph [0023] is not necessary.

35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 13, and 14 stand rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 2,190,439 (Wohl) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,716,505 (Chan). Wohl shows an adapter with a plug end 10. A guide ring 14 is coaxial with the plug end 10 and is rotatable through 180° (see col. 1, line 41) about the common axis of the plug end 10 and the guide ring 14. A socket 20 is rotatable through 180° (see col. 2, line 1) about a transverse axis b-b with respect to the guide ring 14. Thus, a bulb 21 in the socket 20 may be pointed in any direction.

direction within a hemisphere centered on the axis of the plug end 10. The bulb is provided with a reflector that directs its beam radially away from the center of rotation, see Fig. 1.

Chan describes a novelty lamp comprising a series of “pyramidal” segments that are mounted one on top of another to form an arm and that can be rotated relative to each other to allow a variety of shapes for the lamp and a variety of directions for the emitted light. Chan uses a low-voltage supply with commutator rings between segments to allow unrestricted rotation of each segment on the next.

The examiner contends that it would have been obvious to use the 360° commutator connection of Chan in the adapter of Wohl “to provide such device with the capability of being in any desired direction, as per the teachings of Chan.” However, the adapter of Wohl, when used as Wohl intended, already has the capability of being aimed in any direction by the use of the 180° rotations that Wohl provides. There would be no motivation to substitute the connection of Chan for the connection of Wohl, because it would not in fact provide any improvement in performance. It is therefore believed that the present invention, as claimed in claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 13, and 14, would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art over the cited references.

Claims 7-12 stand rejected as obvious over Wohl in view of Chan and further in view of the examiner’s assertion that a light bulb having a coating to focus light in a desired direction is well known. The examiner cites three documents, U.S. Patent No. 1,906,188 (Smally), U.S. Patent No. 2,118,785 (Birdseye), and U.S. Patent No. 4,982,131 (Meyer) as examples of such a coated light bulb. For the reasons set out above, it is believed that the proposed combination of Wohl and Chan would not have been obvious.

The examiner contends that the person skilled in the art would have been motivated to use a coated light bulb in Wohl’s adapter “to increase the efficiency of the illumination device by concentrating and directing the light rays towards an intended target of illumination.” However, Wohl’s adapter already has a reflector to concentrate and direct the light rays, see Fig. 1. The reflective surfaces in Smally, Birdseye, and Meyer would merely duplicate the reflector already provided by Wohl. There would thus have been no motivation to use a coated bulb, because it would not have provided any further benefit. For this reason also it is believed that the present invention, as claimed in claims 7-12, would not

have been obvious over the combination of Wohl, Chan, and the examiner's allegation that coated light bulbs are well known.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the present invention, as now claimed, is not obvious over the cited references. Reconsideration of the examiner's rejections and objection, and an early notice of allowance of all claims, are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BARTON A. PASTERNAK, *ET AL.*

By: 

DANIEL A. MONACO
Registration No. 30,480
Drinker Biddle & Reath, LLP
One Logan Square
18th and Cherry Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19103
202-842-8879
(215) 988-2757 (fax)
Attorney for Applicants

BEST AVAILABLE COPY